REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed on September 10, 2007 (Paper No./Date 20070904). Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-6 and 11-26 remain pending. Claims 7-10 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the Application and present claims are respectfully requested.

I.   Response to Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0015835 to *Kotnur, et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

A.   Claim 22

Claim 22 as amended recites:

> A system for data object transformation, the system
> comprising:
> a communications line;
> ***a transformation adapter*** coupled to the communications
> line, the transformation adapter including:
> an assembly/disassembly layer configured to
> convert messages from a first communications format to a second
> communications format;
> a transformation layer configured to convert data
> objects from a first object type to a second object type using one
> or more transformation classes, ***the one or more transformation***

***classes being configured to transform the one or more data
objects from the first object type to the second object type***;
and
a method invocation layer;
a transformation class generator coupled to the
transformation adapter, the transformation class generator
configured to generate the one or more transformation classes
using transformation mapping rules***, the mapping rules
including eXtensible Markup Language (XML) based syntax
that uses rule specification guide to facilitate transforming
the one or more data objects from the first object type to the
second object type***; and
an application coupled to the transformation adapter,
wherein the application transmits data to and receives data from
the method invocation layer.

(Emphasis Added)

Kotnur apparently focuses on converting static object into a distributed object. For

example, *Kotnur* discloses converting a static object like a java class or .dll into distributed

objects by using different methodologies, such as, RMI, CORBA, *etc*. The *Kotnur*

methodologies allow external entities to access the object through standard interfaces by

generating codes that wrap and register the static objects into a specified middleware. *Kotnur*

uses the term middleware as any distributed technologies that enable external entities to

access objects. *Kotnur* intended to merely expose back end object format into middleware.

On the contrary, the claimed invention focuses on transforming objects from one format

to another by a transformation adapter, which is shown in Fig. 1 of the present application. The

transformation adapter exposes application functionalities on a middleware, such as, RMI,

TIBCO, CORBA, *etc*. The claimed invention focuses on transforming data objects by the

adapter rather than building communication layer (layer connects to middleware) as taught by

Kotnur. More specifically, the claimed invention converts data objects are using transformation

classes, which are configured to transform the data objects from the first object type to the

second object type. The transformation classes are generated using mapping rules, which

include eXtensible Markup Language (XML) based syntax that uses rule specification guide to

11

facilitate transforming the one or more data objects from the first object type to the second object type.

Applicants respectfully assert that *Kotnur* focuses on a system which generates layer that expose an object into a middleware. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Kotnur* does not teach or disclose transforming data objects by the transformation adapter from one format to another based on transformation classes and mapping rules, as recited in claim 22. Consequently, for at least this reason, among others, Applicants respectfully request that claim 22 be allowed and the rejection be withdrawn.

B.   Independent claims 1, 11, 17 and 26

Applicants respectfully submit that for reasons related to those discussed above, *Kotnur* fails to teach or disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 11, 17 and 26.

C.   Dependent Claims 2-6, 12-16, 18-21, and 23-25

Because independent claims 1, 11, 17, 22 and 26 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-6, 12-16, 18-21, and 23-25 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-6, 12-16, 18-21, and 23-25 contain all features and elements of their respective independent base claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to dependent claims 2-6, 12-16, 18-21, and 23-25 should be withdrawn for at least this reason, among others.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Minh N. Nguyen/
Minh N. Nguyen
Registration No. 53,864